UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/523,587	02/04/2005	John C. Evans	2765/112US	5822
23638 7 ADAMS EVAN	7590 03/22/2007 IS P.A.	EXAMINER		
201 SOUTH COLLEGE STREET, SUITE 2350			LEWIS, KIM M	
CHARLOTTE, NC 28244		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3772	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/22/2007	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summers	10/523,587	EVANS, JOHN C.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kim M. Lewis	3772			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .					
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) 1-11 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 12-15, 17, 18 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 16 and 19 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>					
Application Papers					
<ul> <li>9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</li> <li>10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</li> <li>11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</li> </ul>					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)	·				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/1/05 and 8/26/05.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite atent Application			

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statements filed 3/1/05 and 8/26/05 have been received and made of record. Note the acknowledged PTO 1449 forms enclosed herewith.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As regards claims 18, "the reactive system" lacks proper antecedent basis.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

Application/Control Number: 10/523,587 Page 3

Art Unit: 3772

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 12-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No.202/0164911 ("Cunningham et al.")

As regards claims 12-13, .Cunningham et al. disclose in para. [0005-006] that it is known to insert a high modulus fibre in either the weft or warp direction of knitted fabrics as the knit fabric is being formed on the knitting machine. Thus, the subject matter of claims 12 and 13 are not novel.

As regards claim 14, not en disclosure of fiberglass in para. [0005].

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 8. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ("Cunningham et al.").

Art Unit: 3772

As regards claim 15, paras. [0005-0006] fail to teach that the ballistic resistant yarn known and used by the prior art is an aramid fiber. However, Cunningham et al. disclose that aramid fibers are ballistic yarns. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use any well known ballistic resistant yarn to reinforce the fabric since the substitution of one yarn for another yarn is within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

As regards claim 17, Cunningham et al. disclose in paras. [0005-0006] that a knitting machine is used, but fails to disclose Raschel knitting machine, thereby failing to teach a double needle bar Raschel knit for the (fabric) substrate. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a double needle bar Raschel knitting machine depending upon the knit desired.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 9. Claims 1-11 are allowed.
- 10. Claim 18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 11. Claims 16 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim M. Lewis whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 3772

4796. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Bianco, can be reached on (571) 272-4940. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571/272-1090.

Kim M. Lewis Primary Examiner Art Unit 3772

kml March 17, 2007